

## UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231

SERIAL NUMBER   FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
08/014,911 02/08/9	3 DAVIS	W 15444
		NGUYEN, EXAMINER
	32M1/0111	
THE WHITAKER CORP.		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER
<ul> <li>4550 NEW LINDEN HILL SUITE 450</li> </ul>	RD.	3
WILMINGTON, DE 1980	8	3202
		DATE MAILED: 01/11/94
This is a communication from the examiner in COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRAD	n charge of your application. EMARKS	01/11/54
A shortened statutory period for response to the	Responsive to communication filed on his action is set to expire month(s) nse will cause the application to become abando	days from the date of this letter
Part I THE FOLLOWING ATTACHMENT(S		nea. 35 U.S.C. 133
A Mariana Carana	: 1	
Notice of References Cited by Exa     Notice of Art Cited by Applicant, P		ice of Draftsman's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948
5. Information on How to Effect Draw		ice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152.
Part II SUMMARY OF ACTION		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
*****	1 2 2	
1. Claims	1-20	are pending in the application
Of the above, claims		are withdrawn from consideration.
2. Claims		
3. Claims	·	are allowed.
4. Claims	1-20	are rejected.
5. Claims		are objected to.
6. Claims	a	re subject to restriction or election requirement.
· 7. This application has been filed with inf	formal drawings under 37 C.F.R. 1.85 which are	acceptable for examination purposes.
8. Formal drawings are required in respo	onse to this Office action.	
9. The corrected or substitute drawings have acceptable; and acceptable	nave been received on (see explanation or Notice of Draftsman's Pater	. Under 37 C.F.R. 1.84 these drawings t Drawing Review, PTO-948).
10. The proposed additional or substitute examiner; disapproved by the exa	sheet(s) of drawings, filed on miner (see explanation).	has (have) been approved by the
11. The proposed drawing correction, filed	, has been approx	red; 🛘 disapproved (see explanation).
12. Acknowledgement is made of the claim been filed in parent application, seri	n for priority under 35 U.S.C. 119. The certified ial no; filed on;	copy has Deen received not been received
13. Since this application apppears to be in accordance with the practice under Ex	n condition for allowance except for formal matter parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.	rs, prosecution as to the merits is closed in
14. Other		

Serial No. 08/014,911

Art Unit 3202

- 1. Claims 13, 15 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
- The term "conductive surface area" recited in claims 3, 10,
   and 20 lack proper antecedent basis.

The term "the signal contacts" recited in claims 5 and 15 also lack proper antecedent basis.

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103 which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Subject matter developed by another person, which qualifies as prior art only under subsection (f) or (g) of section 102 of this title, shall not preclude patentability under this section where the subject matter and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person.

4. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103, the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 C.F.R. § 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of potential 35 U.S.C. § 102(f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Serial No. 08/014,911
Art Unit 3202

- 5. Claims 1-2, 4-12, 14-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Olsson in view of Buchter et al.
- 6. It would have been obvious at the time applicant's invention was made to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify or construct the ribs 22 of Olsson's connector housing to act as ramp wiping surfaces in view of Buchter's teaching of ramp wiping surfaces 100 located in front of contacts 74, 76, 78 as shown in figure 2. Ramp wiping surfaces would provide cleaning for portions of contact of a mating connector prior to contact engagement. The use of "power" contacts in an electrical connector as recited in claims 5 and 15 are old and well known in the art.
- 7. Claims 3 and 13 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112 and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.
- 8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Nomura et al. and Verdun are further cited to show shielded electrical connecting assemblies.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Examiner Khiem Nguyen at telephone number (703) 308-1738.

Nguyen/tnt January 06, 1994

Khiem Rougen